CHECKLIST ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

Project Name:	Ted Roberts Placer Mine Reclamation
Proposed Implementation Date:	Spring/Summer 2017
Proponent:	Ted Roberts 7216 Applegate Drive Helena, MT 59601
Location:	Section 16 – T5N-R1E (Common Schools)
County:	Broadwater

I. TYPE AND PURPOSE OF ACTION

The proponent acquired a permit to mine the State tract identified above for gold in May, 2005. The placer mining permit expired on May 16, 2015 and has since remained unreclaimed. This purpose of this license is to allow the previous Permittee to enter the track for the sole purpose of reclaiming the disturbance caused by mining under permit M-1972-05.

II. PROJECT DEVELOPMENT

1. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT, AGENCIES, GROUPS OR INDIVIDUALS CONTACTED:

Provide a brief chronology of the scoping and ongoing involvement for this project.

Ted Roberts,
State of Montana Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ): Hard Rock Mining Bureau
State of Montana DNRC: Surface and Mineral Owner. Helena Unit Manager – Andy Burgoyne, Helena Unit, Land Use Specialist – Casey Kellog, Engineer - Trevor Taylor, Mineral Resource Specialist - Heidi Crum, and DNRC Surface lessee: Bobbie Hicks

2. OTHER GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES WITH JURISDICTION, LIST OF PERMITS NEEDED:

State of Montana DEQ – Hard Rock Mining Small Miners Exclusion Statement (SMES)

3. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED:

No Action Alternative: The existing mine area would remain unreclaimed and would result in highwall areas that could pose a risk to the public as well as livestock. Weeds present on the mined terrain would also remain and be allowed to spread.

Action Alternative: The Land Use License would be issued and the site would be reclaimed according to the requirements stated in the mining permit, M-1972-05, as well as the DEQ requirements.

III. IMPACTS ON THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

- *RESOURCES potentially impacted are listed on the form, followed by common issues that would be considered.*
- *Explain POTENTIAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATIONS following each resource heading.*
- *Enter "NONE" If no impacts are identified or the resource is not present.*

4. GEOLOGY AND SOIL QUALITY, STABILITY AND MOISTURE:

Consider the presence of fragile, compactable or unstable soils. Identify unusual geologic features. Specify any special reclamation considerations. Identify any cumulative impacts to soils.

The project area is located approximately 1 mile southeast of Radersburg in an area that was previously mined for gold. The historic mining left large dredge piles that currently occupy much of the permit area. Little topsoil was left after the historic mining ceased and over time vegetation started to establish. Areas within the permit boundary that haven't been affected by historic mining contained very little native topsoil.

5. WATER QUALITY, QUANTITY AND DISTRIBUTION:

Identify important surface or groundwater resources. Consider the potential for violation of ambient water quality standards, drinking water maximum contaminant levels, or degradation of water quality. Identify cumulative effects to water resources.

A groundwater well was drilled in 2008 in order to provide water for the mining operation. The well (GWIC Id: 246676) was drilled to a depth of 105 feet and yielded 30 gallons/minute. This water could potentially be a valuable source of water for agricultural use in the future.

6. AIR QUALITY:

What pollutants or particulate would be produced? Identify air quality regulations or zones (e.g. Class I air shed) the project would influence. Identify cumulative effects to air quality.

A temporary increase in airborne pollutants and particulates would occur from machinery during proposed reclamation activities. The proponent plans to conduct much of the dirt work continuously for a duration of approximately one week. Once the dirt work has been completed, air quality should return to normal.

7. VEGETATION COVER, QUANTITY AND QUALITY:

What changes would the action cause to vegetative communities? Consider rare plants or cover types that would be affected. Identify cumulative effects to vegetation.

The mining boundary in Section 16 contains a limited variety of prairie grasses sparsely growing on the historic dredge piles. Species on this section include Bluebunch Wheatgrass, Idaho Fescue, and Mountain Sage. Also existing in the area disturbed by mining are Knapweed, Hounds Tongue, and Black Henbane.

Disturbed areas would be required to be revegetated in accordance to the original mining permit and any noxious weeds located in the mine permit area would be required to be sprayed.

8. TERRESTRIAL, AVIAN AND AQUATIC LIFE AND HABITATS:
Consider substantial habitat values and use of the area by wildlife, birds or fish. Identify cumulative effects to fish and wildlife.

A variety of big game, small mammals, raptors, upland game birds and songbirds use this area and activities from the proposed project could disrupt wildlife movement and patterns.

9. UNIQUE, ENDANGERED, FRAGILE OR LIMITED ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES:
Consider any federally listed threatened or endangered species or habitat identified in the project area. Determine effects to wetlands. Consider Sensitive Species or Species of special concern. Identify cumulative effects to these species and their habitat.

A search was conducted using the Montana Natural Heritage Program (MNHP) database to identify point observations of species of concern in the section of the proposed activity.

No species of concern were located within 2 miles of the mine operation; therefore, reclamation activities should not affect any of the know species of concern in the vicinity.

10. HISTORICAL AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES:
Identify and determine effects to historical, archaeological or paleontological resources.

This site has been nearly completely disturbed from previous mining activity and any archaeological sites that would have existed at the mine site would have been covered or destroyed.

11. AESTHETICS:
Determine if the project is located on a prominent topographic feature, or may be visible from populated or scenic areas. What level of noise, light or visual change would be produced? Identify cumulative effects to aesthetics.

The site to be reclaimed is located west of Highway 285 leading into Radersburg. Historic dredge piles and dirt piles block most visibility of the gold mine permit area from the road, therefore most of the reclamation activity should not be visible from the road or the town of Radersburg.

12. DEMANDS ON ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES OF LAND, WATER, AIR OR ENERGY:
Determine the amount of limited resources the project would require. Identify other activities nearby that the project would affect. Identify cumulative effects to environmental resources.

The reclamation of the mine area should not require limited resources to complete.

13. OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTS PERTINENT TO THE AREA:
List other studies, plans or projects on this tract. Determine cumulative impacts likely to occur as a result of current private, state or federal actions in the analysis area, and from future proposed state actions in the analysis area that are under MEPA review (scoped) or permitting review by any state agency.

No other environmental documents were found that pertain to Section 16 in T5N-R1E.

IV. IMPACTS ON THE HUMAN POPULATION

- *RESOURCES potentially impacted are listed on the form, followed by common issues that would be considered.*
- *Explain POTENTIAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATIONS following each resource heading.*
- *Enter "NONE" If no impacts are identified or the resource is not present.*

14. HUMAN HEALTH AND SAFETY:
Identify any health and safety risks posed by the project.

No human and health safety risks were identified as a result of the proposed project other than the typical occupational hazards that coincide with mine reclamation operations. The proponent would be held liable for all risks to human health and safety.

15. INDUSTRIAL, COMMERCIAL AND AGRICULTURE ACTIVITIES AND PRODUCTION:
Identify how the project would add to or alter these activities.

The proposed project is not expected to alter current or future industrial, commercial, and agricultural activities and production.

16. QUANTITY AND DISTRIBUTION OF EMPLOYMENT:
Estimate the number of jobs the project would create, move or eliminate. Identify cumulative effects to the employment market.

The proposed project would not create, move, or eliminate jobs.

17. LOCAL AND STATE TAX BASE AND TAX REVENUES:
Estimate tax revenue the project would create or eliminate. Identify cumulative effects to taxes and revenue.

None. The proponent is only reclaiming an existing site.

18. DEMAND FOR GOVERNMENT SERVICES:
Estimate increases in traffic and changes to traffic patterns. What changes would be needed to fire protection, police, schools, etc.? Identify cumulative effects of this and other projects on government services.

None.

19. LOCALLY ADOPTED ENVIRONMENTAL PLANS AND GOALS:
List State, County, City, USFS, BLM, Tribal, and other zoning or management plans, and identify how they would affect this project.

None that are known.

20. ACCESS TO AND QUALITY OF RECREATIONAL AND WILDERNESS ACTIVITIES:
Identify any wilderness or recreational areas nearby or access routes through this tract. Determine the effects of the project on recreational potential within the tract. Identify cumulative effects to recreational and wilderness activities.

None.

21. DENSITY AND DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION AND HOUSING:
Estimate population changes and additional housing the project would require. Identify cumulative effects to population and housing.

None.

22. SOCIAL STRUCTURES AND MORES:
Identify potential disruption of native or traditional lifestyles or communities.

None.

23. CULTURAL UNIQUENESS AND DIVERSITY:
How would the action affect any unique quality of the area?

None.

24. OTHER APPROPRIATE SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC CIRCUMSTANCES:
Estimate the return to the trust. Include appropriate economic analysis. Identify potential future uses for the analysis area other than existing management. Identify cumulative economic and social effects likely to occur as a result of the proposed action.

The existing grazing lease provides approximately $1,420.00 in annual revenue from Section 16 that goes to Common Schools. The proponent has provided $25 for a land use license.

EA Checklist Prepared By:	Name: Trevor	Date: 5/26/17
	Title: Engineer	

V. FINDING

25. ALTERNATIVE SELECTED:

After reviewing the Environmental Assessment, I have selected the Action Alternative, to issue a Land Use License. I believe this alternative can be implemented in a manner that is consistent with the long-term sustainable natural resource management of the area and generate revenue for the common school trust.

26. SIGNIFICANCE OF POTENTIAL IMPACTS:

I conclude all identified potential impacts will be mitigated by utilizing the stipulations listed below and no significant impacts will occur as a result of implementing the selected alternative.

27. NEED FOR FURTHER ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS:

[ ] EIS [ ] More Detailed EA [X] No Further Analysis

EA Checklist Approved By:	Name:	Monte Mason		
	Title:	MMB Bureau Chief		
Signature:	Monte L Mason		Date:	5/26/17